SOME NEW BOOKS.

A History of Congregationalism.

The meaning now attaching to the term Congregationalism in the United States is well enough understood, but few persons are conversant with the long, intricate, and difficult processes by which the modern definition has been reached, or appreciate how closely and vitally the evolution of the idea has been associated with the movement of religious thought in England since the day of Queen Elizabeth. An exposition of this theme, which constitutes an important chapter in the history of Protestantism, has been long desired, and the want of an exhaustive and authentic treatise on the subject is now met in a volume of one thousand pages entitled, *Congregationalism as Seen in its Literature*, by HENRY MARTYN DEXTER (Harpers.)

Before retracing, with the help of Mr. Dexter's researches, the steps by which the current notion of Congregationalism has been attained, it may be well to call to mind the twofold sense which the word bears in popular acceptation. In a common, though manifestly narrow and denominational application, the term is used to designate a loosely organized group of churches which uphold the Calvinistic system of theology as it has been explained and amended by the theologians of New England in their successive generations. In this popular signification the particular form of creed professed is perhaps more distinctly suggested than a given type of church polity, and readers who approach this book with this conception of the subject in their minds may be disappointed upon finding that relatively little space is devoted to the history of religious controversy and dogmatic theology, and that even the great Unitarian revolt is touched upon but briefly as being, so to speak, a minor and collateral topic. Not that Mr. Dexter does not assert, in the last of these twelve lectures, somewhat perfunctorily, we think, that the term Congregationalist has an historic as well as an etymologic sense, and that, the original motive of church independence having been the desire for a purer doctrine, no lax teachings can honorably claim recognition as Congregational. Such an averment could scarcely be dispensed with in lectures delivered before the Andover Theological Seminary, seeing that one and the same system of ecclesiastical organization is adopted, not only by those known in New England as Congregationalists, but also by the Baptist denomination, by Unitarians and Universalists, and by some of those who hold the theological opinions of the Methodists. If we look, however, to the carefully circumscribed scope of his inquiry, we shall see that the author has, for the most part, contemplated the term Congregationalism in its strictly etymological sense as opposed, not to this or that profession of faith, but to such types of church polity as Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, Papacy. From the point of view generally taken in this volume, the essential peculiarity of Congregationalism is that it maintains the independence of each particular congregation of Christians, and their sufficiency to perfect and preserve their own organization, and to perform all needful ecclesiastical acts. That was the definition formulated by Robert Brown in 1586, and, although not infrequently disputed or amended, it was substantially maintained by a large portion of the Congregational body until the Unitarian movement compelled them, in self-defence, to enforce some principle of restraint upon dogmatic divergence, and to insist that a measure of reciprocal recognition and fellowship between churches was no less essential than the virtual independence of the individual society. And thus the ultimate conclusion reached by Mr. Dexter is that the specific difference of a Congregational Church lies in the two conditions: that it be organically an entity, complete in itself, and that still it be such in sisterly relations with all similar bodies. Here, of course, a distinction is clearly marked between a so-called Independent and a Congregational Church. The former need not live in fraternal relations with kindred organisms; the latter, in Mr. Dexter's statement of the definition now accepted, must do so. It seems, however, that in his account of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Mr. Dexter does not attempt to discriminate between Independency or Separatism and Congregationalism.

Our author himself condenses the fruit of his extensive investigations in the remark that no fewer than five underlying philosophies have energized and shaped the inward processes of churches called Congregational. Of these the first was Brownism, which made Christ absolute monarch over His church, yet conceived Him to reign by so imparting His wisdom and spirit to its individual members as to practically leave all church power in the hands of those members. This was a theory of absolute monarchy in ecclesiastical concerns, indistinguishable in its results from a pure democracy. Next came Francis Johnson's plan of "telling it to the elders," which Mr. Dexter describes as a species of High Church Barrowism, lodging all power of government in the hands of the Presbytery of Elders, and leaving to the members, after they had chosen those elders, the single right of entire submission to them. In the third place arose a somewhat looser conception of church polity, which our author discusses under the name of Ainsworthism, or Low Church Barrowism, a scheme of organization which required the elders to act in concert with the Church, and not in seclusion from it, and which only made the decision of the Presbytery effectual after it had received the approval of the brethren. Ainsworth's plan is in turn distinguished from a fourth theory of church polity, advocated by another and more distinguished exile in Holland, namely, Robinsonism, or Broad Church Barrowism, which added a Catholicizing element in the recognition of the reality, though not the regularity, of churches otherwise organized, and in guarded communion with them. Last among these philosophies we have the "Congregationalism of to-day," which was powerfully championed by John Wise of Ipswich, Mass., in the early years of the eighteenth century, whose "fundamental principle," says our author, "derives all ecclesiastical power (as Brownism did) under God from the free consenting action of the entire covenanted body in each church regarded as an individual entity;" affirming, in other words, democracy to be the fittest and best government for Church as well as State. It will be observed that nothing is said in this description of the "Congregationalism of to-day" about the necessity of maintaining fellowship, or about the right of a council or aggregation of churches to expel a particular society from the Congregational denomination. The conflict between these divergent notions of church polity, and the successive steps by which the view now current in New England became dominant, can best be indicated by a brief survey of the synods, councils, and conventions held at various dates, and in which the principles of Presbyterianism and Independency have come into more or less acute collision.

Turning first to the internal polity of English Congregationalism, we find that it makes no use of councils. Had Cromwell lived, there is no doubt that the Independents would have organized some scheme of ecclesiastical government; but their harsh experience after the Restoration led them to emphasize the sufficiency of each local church to and for itself. This, of course, has been done at the expense of the correlate principle of the communion of the churches, a principle which, as we shall see, has occupied a larger place in the thought and affection of the New England people. In the old country Congregationalists have never used the American methods tending to consociation, and practically know nothing about them. That feature of their system of church order and discipline which bears upon this subject affirms that "it is the duty of Christian churches to hold communion with each other, and to coöperate for the promotion of the Christian cause;" but it is expressly declared that "no church, or union of churches, has any right or power to interfere with the faith or discipline of any other church further than to separate from such as in faith or practice depart from the gospel of Christ." It is clear, as Mr. Dexter hints, that this English doctrine of fellowship and mutual accountability is vague and liberal enough to satisfy the most determined seeker for modern improvements. Our author acknowledges that on one point some English Congregational churches have drifted away from what American Congregationalists still regard as a dogma of supreme importance, namely, the doctrine of the future eternal punishment of those who die impenitent. This relaxation of the ancient faith seems to take in England the direction either of "annihilation" or of "restoration" through further probation. The defeat, however, of the attempt made in 1878 to commit the Congregational churches of England to the averment that "religious communion is not dependent on agreement in theological, critical, or historical opinion," may be taken to prove that the dominant doctrines of the Congregational body are still essentially orthodox. Before leaving this part of our subject it may be instructive to collate some English statistics relating to this denomination, with those bearing on the same organization in the United States. It appears that there are now in England some 3,687 churches and branch churches, against 3,620 in the United States, and 3,426 ministers by the side of our 3,496. The total membership of these English churches does not seem to have been a matter of inquiry with the compiler of their statistics, but applying the average which obtains among us of about 102 to each church, Mr. Dexter computes that there would be some 376,000 members of British societies to place against the 375,654 reported from the United States. Another striking feature of resemblance between the last year's returns of Congregationalism in the two countries is found in the number of ministers removed from each by death during the preceding twelvemonth, which is 58 in England to 54 in this country.

Glancing now at the development of cohesion and supervision among the Congregationalists of New England, we may premise that Brownism recognized councils, while High Church Barrowism repudiated them. It is further important to bear in mind that while Plymouth was settled by Separatists belonging to John Robinson's congregation of English exiles in Holland, the colonists of Massachusetts Bay were Nonconformists, but not Separatists. Nevertheless the Salem community soon set up a separate church, and Winthrop's community did the same. The notions of these societies, however, regarding order and discipline may be deduced from the writings of John Cotton and Richard Mather, all of which reproduce an intense High Church Barrowism, which lodged absolute power over church members in the hands of the Presbytery of Elders. The first synod, or, as we should now call it, council, held in Massachusetts Bay, assembled at Newtown, afterward named Cambridge, in 1637. This meeting examined and condemned eighty-two "erroneous opinions," and resolved that while private members, might for information, ask questions after sermon, yet it ought to be done wisely and sparingly, and "with leave of the elders." It is worth noting, however, that a motion to hold a like synod once a year, or at least the next year, was not carried; whence it may be inferred that the growing Presbyterianism of England was not yet fully reflected in the colonies. Of the second synod, held at Cambridge in 1643, the year in which the Westminster Assembly was called together, it is recorded that the meeting was much enjoyed, but the ministers thought they would not need one every year. By 1646, however, the Presbyterians were masters of England, and accordingly the General Court of Massachusetts passed an order that all the churches of the colony should assemble in synod at Cambridge to construct a scheme of order and discipline. After a session of two years this synod adopted what is known as the Cambridge platform, and their action, somewhat modified, was finally sanctioned by the General Court in 1661.

A comparison of the form of church polity thus established with the system framed by the Presbyterians of the Westminster Assembly will disclose some points of decided difference. One distinction is concerned with the subject of toleration, as to which the Presbyterians accused the New England men of the greatest looseness. But the chief divergence had to do with the power of synods. The New England men were clear that synods are for advice, and for the moral power of persuasion only; while the Presbyterians held that they exercised the authority of Christ over the many congregations of the one Church. And Robert Baillie, while in attendance upon the Westminster Assembly, wrote of the New England Independents: "They give only so much authority to a neighbor congregation, when they receive no satisfaction from any scandalous congregation, as to abstain from communion with it, and to pronounce their sentence of that non-communion with it." This Baillie complains of, and says: "The sooner all the Reformed declare against them, it will be the better." And in general the Presbyterians charged that if every congregation were allowed to have sole church power within itself, with no other than merely advisory supervision, it must inevitably bring in a toleration of all religions, if not an ecclesiastical and spiritual anarchy. From the fact, however, that no complaint of Brownism was put forward, it seems plain that the Cambridge platform was not then violently suspected of being a democratic system. Indeed, Rutherford, whom John Cotton declared to be "a great part of the assembly at Westminster," volunteered to approve the New Englanders as "well sound, if they had given a little more power to synods." All of this manifestly goes to confirm the judgment which Mr. Dexter has reached from other sources of evidence, that the early Congregationalism of this country was Barrowism, and not Brownism, a congregationalized Presbyterianism, or a presbyterianized Congregationalism, which had its roots in the one system, and its branches in the other; which was essentially Genevan within the local congregation, and outside of it essentially different from the scheme of Geneva. The forty or fifty churches which, "for the substance of it," adopted the Cambridge platform upheld, indeed, this general system, with varying degrees of strictness, from the almost Presbyterian principles of Hingham and Newbury to the large-minded and large-hearted Robinsonism of the mother Mayflower Church.

The first synod which was called in New England after the formation of the Cambridge platform assembled at Boston in 1657, but failed to compose the strife which had arisen in the churches, and accordingly, five years later, another synod of above seventy members met in the same town, and established the so-called "half-way covenant." By this measure a qualified and subordinate membership, carrying with it all privileges except that of partaking in the Lord's Supper, was conceded to baptized persons of moral life and orthodox belief. This concession was vehemently opposed, especially by the more intelligent and influential laymen, and for a considerable period the controversy between the Synodists and anti-Synodists divided New England. The contention of the Synod and its apologists was that if something of this sort were not done, it would be impossible to prevent the churches from so lowering the terms of full communion as to admit unworthy persons to all privileges; than which evil they judged that any that might grow out of the new measure must be less. Seventeen years later, however, another council known as the Reforming Synod, reaffirmed the Cambridge platform, and, while they said nothing about the half-way covenant, advised that care be taken to admit none to the communion in the Lord's Supper who had not made full profession of saving faith. This seems to have proved in practice too stringent a rule for the majority, for the explanations of Cotton Mather indicate that by the time they passed into the eighteenth century the churches of New England had become so far spiritually devitalized by the half-way covenant that, while many were ready openly to avow that baptism and a morally correct life entitled those who made no claim to experimental piety to full communion in the Lord's Supper, the remainder, who, perhaps, were not prepared to go so far themselves, were yet willing to acquiesce in such a view to the degree that it produced "no troublesome variance or contention among them."

Meanwhile, ruling elders seem to have grown so scarce that the Presbytery in a given church would often consist of its pastor only. Some churches, however, steadfastly resisted the pastor's autocracy, and the Saybrook Synod, called in 1708, attempted to compose the quarrel, but the "heads of agreement" which they recommended failed to gain acceptance outside of the New Haven colony. Equivalent proposals put forth in Massachusetts Bay by the ministers of Boston proved too strong Presbyterian meat for Congregational palates. These proposals were presently overwhelmed by the tremendous assault of John Wise of Ipswich, whose little books, printed between 1710 and 1717, presented a cogent argument for democracy as the only true government for Church or State. The effect of these writings was prodigious, and a subsequent attempt, the last prior to the Revolution, to assemble another synod entirely miscarried. We need not say that the establishment of American independence tended signally to favor democratic Brownism at the cost of aristocratic Barrowism.

The last strenuous endeavor in Massachusetts after true "consociationism," that is to say, a genuine organic union of Congregational churches, took place in 1815. The Unitarian controversy had developed evils, and a good many of them, which minds inclining toward Presbyterianism fancied would be better dealt with by a church government that should have some kind of tribunals among its resources. Accordingly, the General Association of Massachusetts, which met in the year just named, was asked to recommend to the churches to adopt a form of consociation identical with that which had stirred up John Wise to indignant onslaught one hundred years before. After waiting a year, the association ventured timidly to vote that they had "no objection to the churches taking this course" in those parts of the Commonwealth in which the sentiments of ministers and churches were favorable to its adoption, "if they felt so disposed." The event proved that they did not feel so disposed, and the matter dropped again. Still another flounder in the same direction was made in 1844, when an assembly of Congregational ministers, held in Boston, "sang the old Consociational song very sweetly once more," but it once more found the great body of Congregationalists in that condition "which heareth not the voice of the enchanter, though he be most expert in charming."

The last twenty years have shown a marked advance in the direction of conventions, conferences, and other efforts to develop and invigorate the practical unity and denominational force of Congregational churches. For example, in 1852, 463 elders and messengers from a great number of churches assembled in convention at Albany, and one result of their meeting was to discontinue the Plan of Union which had been entered into in the year 1801 between the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church and the general association of the State of Connecticut, a union whose most obvious fruit had been the presbyterianizing of hundreds of churches outside of New England, which, it was averred, might otherwise have remained Congregational. Another result was the formation of the American Congregational Union, especially intended to assist feeble Congregational churches to erect houses of worship. Again, in 1865, five hundred and two elders and messengers, delegated by the churches of five-and-twenty States, met at the Old South Meeting House, in Boston, to set forth a declaration of the common faith and polity. This council unanimously recognized as distinctive of the Congregational system, the principle that "the local, or Congregational Church, derives its power and authority directly from Christ, and is not subjected to any ecclesiastical government exterior or superior to itself." Upon another warmly debated question, it resolved that "the ministry of the Gospel by members of the churches who have been duly called and set apart to that work implies in itself no power of government." Finally, in 1871, 275 delegates from the churches of twenty-five States met at Oberlin, Ohio, and organized "The National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States." This council was careful to incorporate into its fundamental law two provisions by which all danger of the subversion of the inherent rights of the churches seems to be precluded. One of these was an averment that "the right of government resides in local churches or congregations of believers," although "all churches, being in communion one with another, have mutual duties subsisting in the obligations of fellowship." The other provision was an explicit declaration meant to allay the jealousy that might be aroused in some quarters by a reference to the duties of fellowship, namely, that "the National Council shall never exercise legislative or judicial authority, nor consent to act as a council of reference."

We would not leave this capacious volume, which really constitutes a sort of encyclopædia of Congregationalism, without adverting to what the author has to say about the severest blow ever dealt the denomination in this country, to wit, the loss experienced in church membership and church property through the Unitarian schism. The treatment of this subject, as we have mentioned, seems cursory when compared with the minute discussion of other themes, perhaps more germane to the specific purpose of the book. Nevertheless, a good many curious and instructive facts are chronicled. The reader is especially struck by the headway which the Unitarian movement had acquired before it encountered organized resistance. Indeed, most of the *ex parte* or advisory councils, called, as the phrase ran, in the interest of purity, supported in the majority of instances the claims of the Unitarians, who, although outnumbered in the ranks of church members, seem to have been decidedly more influential in the parishes. It appears that the first overt Unitarian act on this side of the sea was that by which, in 1785, the first Episcopal church in New England became the first Unitarian church in America, through the vote of the proprietors of King's Chapel, Boston, that the Book of Common Prayer, as "amended by the omission of the doctrine of the Trinity," should be thenceforth used in worship by that church and congregation. On the other hand, it is an interesting fact that the first secession of orthodoxy from a church and parish, both already Arian and fast becoming Unitarian in their majority, took place in connection with the original Mayflower Church in Plymouth, Mass. The first pastor to be dismissed for an orthodoxy grown distasteful to the advancing views of his parish, while the majority of his church members clung to him to the last, is said to have been Samuel Worcester, from Fitchburg, Mass., in 1802. The first pastor to be ejected for Unitarian views, which the larger number of his church members did not approve, was, we are told, John Sherman, from Mansfield, Conn., in 1805. Again, the first instance of a refusal, because of his avowed Unitarianism, to ordain a candidate, was probably that of Mr. Samuel Willard, pastor elect at Deerfield, Mass., in 1807, who, however, a month afterward was ordained by a council. The first conflict which developed the new legal view respecting church and parish relations taken by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts began in Sandwich, Mass., in 1811. The pastor, Jonathan Burr, having become a convert to pronounced Calvinistic theology, was requested to resign by a slender majority of the town parish, while a large majority of the church members sustained him. The Unitarians kept Mr. Burr out of the pulpit by force, and an *ex parte* council dismissed him, but a larger council, subsequently called, was of opinion that a majority of the church members constituted the church, owned its property, and were entitled to say who should be minister. The Supreme Court decided, however, that as a church cannot in Massachusetts have legal existence apart from a parish, the minority which still held the original parochial relation was the veritable church, in secure possession of all moneys and other property thereunto belonging. But the most famous case of all, in its legal aspects, was that of the parish in Dedham, which was the first to innovate upon the ancient way of choosing a pastor, it having been the practice heretofore for the church to take the lead, and for the parish afterward to sanction its vote. But in this instance, the parish chose a Unitarian for their minister, and he was ordained by a council in defiance of the remonstrance of two-thirds of the church members, who thereupon seceded, formed a new society, and built a meeting house on the opposite side of the street. The question which was the church went up to the Supreme Court, and was argued before the full bench by Daniel Webster and Theron Metcalf. Chief Justice Parker gave the decision to the effect that, in Massachusetts, a church separating for any cause from a parish loses its existence in the eye of the law, and therefore that the seceding majority of church members could have no right either to the name, furniture, records, or property of the "First Church of Dedham."

Mr. Dexter computes that there were eighty-one churches in Massachusetts, comprehending 3,900 members, "driven out from their own," as he chooses to phrase it, by the operation of the above cited decision. He further estimates that they left behind them by voluntary surrender, to the use and behoof of the 1,282 church members who remained, property of the value of more than $600,000, amounting at six per cent. to an average contribution of more than $450 per annum to the expenses of each of the Unitarian minorities into whose hands it fell. Such are some of the aspects of the grave disaster which overtook New England Congregationalism in the first quarter of this century. But Mr. Dexter has omitted to mention another blow sustained at the same epoch and from the same agency, namely, the loss of Congregational control over Harvard College, which has unquestionably had serious and far-reaching consequences. M. W. H.

Two New Novels.

It has been a matter of some surprise to us that, among the numerous authors of French fiction recently introduced to American readers, such a writer as EARNEST FEYDEAU should have been overlooked. The neglect has seemed the less intelligible because years ago translations were made of two of his novels, viz., "Fanny" and "Daniel," which could hardly be transferred into English with propriety, seeing that the problems therein discussed with a cynical coarseness can hardly be so much as stated in our nice-spoken society. There are other writings of Feydeau, however, to which no serious objection can be taken on the score of morals, and this is especially true of three novels which, while capable of separate publication, really form a consecutive narrative. We refer to "M. De Saint-Bertrand," "Un Début à l'Opéra," and "Le Mari de la Danseuse." The availability of these books for the purposes of an American translator has at length been recognized, and the last of the series is now published under the name of *The Ballet Dancer's Husband* (Chicago, H. A. Sumner & Co.). Mrs. Mary Neal Sherwood, who has executed this version, has done her work carefully and successfully, rendering the strong, idiomatic sentences of the original into terse, lively English, and conveying to the reader the impression of sustained and austere power, for which, next to Flaubert, the author of these novels is perhaps most conspicuous. We regret, nevertheless, that the translator did not begin with the first rather than with the last member of the trilogy, seeing that the evolution of the central character, who constitutes in some respects a new type in rascality, must be followed from the beginning to be adequately appreciated. The outward vicissitudes and mental tribulations of a man who literally wears a borrowed skin, who spends the greater part of his life in the cloak of a false personality, appropriating the name and relationships as well as the fortune of the man whom he has murdered, and undertaking to simulate the intellectual and moral character of his victim, furnish certainly material for a curious psychological study. The same theme was approached, but from a different point of view and with a different object, by Balzac in the several incarnations of "Vautrin," for whose massive intellect and large aspirations we cannot but feel a reluctant sympathy. Vautrin, in fact, is a magnificent outlaw engaged in a duel against the tremendous enginery of modern society. "Saint-Bertrand," on the other hand, is a sneak-thief, irrevocably committed, by some congenital twist, to base and sinuous and abortive courses. The crime with which he starts provides him with an ample social and pecuniary capital; his extraordinary comeliness wins for him the devotion of the most exemplary and noble women, and the whole narrative portrays a sort of contest between repeated strokes of good fortune, resolved, so to speak, to rehabilitate and save, and an ingrained tendency to deterioration. The volume which Mrs. Sherwood has selected for translation chronicles the last stages of his social and moral decadence, which the reader could not contemplate without nausea but for his recognition of the artistic congruity of such an end. To those who like a vigorous and stimulating novel, we may say that this version of M. Feydeau's book, whether viewed in connection with its companion volumes or read as a separate work, is superior to most of the stories translated from the French during the past three months.

Those readers who are acquainted with Mr. R. D. BLACKMORE will feel inclined to give him well nigh the highest place among English novelists, if it be true, as is now quite positively affirmed, that both George Eliot and Charles Reade have withdrawn from the field. Most of us would give the palm to him rather than to Mr. William Black or to Mr. Thomas Hardy, for this conclusive reason, among others less pertinent, that his stories are more interesting. He is, indeed, a genuine tale-weaver, being abundantly furnished with that glorious gift of invention which makes the "Arabian Nights" and "Don Quixote" and "Gil Blas" delightful to thousands who cannot pretend to recognize some of their most admirable merits. Emphasize as we may the difficulty and the value of character drawing, and the zest given by a tart and incisive record of social study, the main thing, after all, is to have a story to tell. If he has none, the artistic frame chosen by the would-be novelist for his lucubrations is, if we call things by their right names, either a blunder or a cheat. The author may be as skilled in the limning of character as La Bruyère or Addison; he may be as captivating an essayist on social topics as Goldsmith or Saint Beuve, but he is not a novelist in the clear, original, and rightful sense in which Cervantes, Le Sage, Balzac, and Fielding may claim the title. Now, when we speak of Mr. Black, some allusion to his transcripts of Highland scenery, or the playful, bantering vein in which his observation and philosophy are expounded, is sure to be first upon the lips and in the mind of his admirers. When we say, on the other hand, that Mr. Thomas Hardy has invented, or at least resurrected, the English pastoral, it is plain that here, too, merits of a kind outside of and distinct from the specific virtue of the story teller have left the most abiding impression. Who, in fact, can recollect the plots of Black's or Hardy's novels, or, recollecting them, could sketch the skeleton of any tale, without a firm conviction that he should bore the listener? It is quite otherwise with the writings of Mr. Blackmore. While his characters, to our thinking, are more robust and agile and intensely vitalized than any which Mr. Hardy or Mr. Black have drawn, and while his diction is more sinewy and nervous, quite as felicitous, too, in pictorial effect, and every whit as sensitive to emotional impulse, these qualities will rather attract and satisfy the critic on a second reading than interrupt the hearty interest and eager curiosity with which he first follows the windings of the tale. In a word, we pay instructive homage by the fervid haste of our perusal to the presence of that gift which in the boyhood of every life and in the boyhood of our race is deemed superlative—the divine gift of invention, the rare power of creating a new, deftly-fashioned, and exciting story. This particular qualification of Mr. Blackmore will be found demonstrated in his latest work—*Mary Anerly*—which is now published by the Harpers. In this tale of Yorkshire as it was eighty years ago the reader will find, we can assure him, a veritable story, which has a beginning, a middle, and an end, and which moves with swiftness and directness from one point to another, and whose outlines can easily be reproduced from memory without the slightest apprehension of putting the auditor to sleep. He will also find other excellencies of a kind more frequently descanted on by critics, for the reason that they form the sole credentials of many English novelists.

Chinese Stories for Children.

A thin volume of eighty pages, tastefully bound in green and gold, contains an interesting collection of *Chinese Stories for Boys and Girls*, edited and translated by ARTHUR E. MOULE, Missionary to Ningpo and Hangchow. (London: Seeley, Jackson & Halliday.) It is an instructive little book, which can be read through in an hour. The stories in their original form belong to a very popular Chinese work in two volumes, which is extensively circulated in China, where many editions are published by rich persons for free distribution among the people. Mr. Moule gives thirty-one of the one hundred and two stories which this work contains, all illustrative of the duty of children to parents, or of brother to brother. He says the Chinese speak of five great relations in life: (1) The duty of Ministers and their Prince; (2) the duty of children and their father; (3) the duties of husband and wife; (4) the duty of brother to brother; and (5) the duty of friend to friend. "Within the four seas," said Confucius, "all men are brethren." Yet our author, as a missionary, feels that with all their moral precepts these people still lack the one thing needful. "They neglect or forget their duty toward God; and no other virtue or excellence can make up for this."

The introductory half of the book, comprising the first two chapters, gives a good deal of curious information about the Chinese which will be certain to interest young people, and will probably be novel to older readers in many particulars. Thus we doubt whether it is generally known that there are no schools for girls in China (except the schools of the foreign missions), or that the poor there seldom beg, the practice of begging being confined almost wholly to a class of professional mendicants, who beg from choice rather than necessity. It is pleasant to learn that Chinese children seem happy, as a rule, notwithstanding the absence of many amusements which contribute largely to the enjoyment of boys and girls in England and America. They do not look sad at all, says Mr. Moule. "They laugh and shout, and they enjoy their Punch and Judy shows, and their fireworks at the new year, and their paper and clay toys, and the rattles for the babies, and their shuttlecocks knocked about with the heels and soles of their shoes, instead of a battledore, and their toy lanterns—paper figures of horses, some of them on wheels with a red candle lit inside—and above all, their kite flying in the spring time." Grandfathers as well as children indulge in this pastime, and with kites of the most various form, representing real beasts, birds, and insects, as well as creatures, such as never were on sea or land. Some of these kites are rendered visible at night by lanterns attached to their tails.

Although the Chinese people, old and young, are fond of fragrant flowers, and both cultivate and wear them, our author notes an apparent indifference to wild flowers, remarking that "the banks of the rivers and canals, which are covered with a carpet of clover and small buttercups in the spring time, never seem to please the children as they would in England." But of all plants the bamboo is probably that which the inhabitants of China have the most reason to esteem. It is not only beautiful, but valuable in a thousand different ways, as our readers must know. A Chinaman may, and frequently does, sit in a bamboo house and eat boiled bamboo shoots with bamboo chop sticks out of a bamboo dish. The uses of this wonderful plant are humorously set forth in the following clever verses in Pigeon English by Major Arthur T. B. Wright, who entitles them "John Chinaman's Lignum Vitæ:"

> One piecee thing that my have got,
> Maskee that thing my no can do,
> You talkey you no sabey what?
> Bamboo.
>
> That chow chow all too muchee sweet
> My likee; what no likee you?
> You makee try, you makee eat
> Bamboo.
>
> That ole house too muchee small,
> My have got chilo, wanchee new;
> My makee one big piecee, all
> Bamboo.
>
> Topside that house my wanchee thatch,
> And bottom-side that matting, too;
> My makee both if my can catch
> Bamboo.
>
> That sun he makes too much hot,
> My makee hat (my talkee true)
> And coat for rain; if my have got
> Bamboo.
>
> That Pilong too much robbery
> He makee; on his back one, two,
> He catchee for his bobbery
> Bamboo.
>
> No wanchee walk that China pig,
> You foreigner no walkee you,
> My carry both upon a big
> Bamboo.
>
> What makee sampan go so fast?
> That time the wind so strong he blew,
> What makee sail and rope an' mast?
> Bamboo.
>
> My catchee everything in life,
> From number one of trees that grew,
> So muchee good I give my wife
> Bamboo.
>
> And now man-man, my talkee done,
> And so my say chin-chin to you;
> My hope you think this number one
> Bamboo.

Turning now to the third chapter, we come to the stories which give Mr. Moule's little book its title. They are all short, there being only three which occupy so much as a page each. The first which we have marked for extract indicates a perfect faith in some sort of existence after death:

> A man named Lee was very dutiful to his mother. She was naturally a very nervous woman, and always dreadfully frightened in a thunder storm.
>
> When she died Lee buried his dear mother in a wood; and whenever the wind arose and a tempest threatened, he ran to the tomb, knelt, and with tears cried out:
>
> "Lee is near you—don't be afraid, mother."

In north China, where the summers are very hot, mosquitoes abound in the warm season, and so annoy the children that Mr. Moule thinks they could never sleep at all if their mothers did not kindly fan them to repose. Our attention is called to the fact that his book was intended primarily for an English audience of young people by a foot note, in which he explains what mosquitoes are! This information would be superfluous to most children in America. The story to which the foot note refers is as follows:

> There was a boy once named Woo Mang, or "Brave and Talkative." When only 8 years old he was very dutiful to his parents.
>
> They were very poor, and could not afford even mosquito curtains for their bed in summer. So their little boy used to get into his parents' bed early in the evening, and let the mosquitoes do their worst at biting him for an hour or two; and then, when they were surfeited with his blood, and fatigued with their exertions, he got out and called to his parents to sleep in peace.

At the close of a story illustrative of fraternal duty, the reader is reminded that such things as "boiling the bean" are directly contrary to benevolence. This phrase, "boiling the bean," which is proverbial in China, originated in the third century of our era, when a distinguished poet, Tsao Chih, was ordered by the Emperor, his elder brother, to compose an ode while walking seven paces. Condign punishment was to follow failure. The poet wrote:

> A kettle had beans inside,
> And stalks of the bean made the fire;
> When the beans to their brother stalks cried,
> We spring from one root—why such ire?

A fine example of patience under exasperating circumstances is furnished by the tale of "Perverse and the Ox," the last that we can quote:

> A certain great officer had a younger brother named Perverse, who was constantly getting intoxicated.
>
> One day, when he was tipsy, he shot at and killed his brother's ox which dragged his cart. When the great man came home his wife met him and said: "Perverse has shot your ox."
>
> He did not seem surprised, nor did he ask questions, but simply said, "Well, let it be cut up for food," and sat quietly down to read. His wife exclaimed again:
>
> "Perverse has shot the ox; this is no light matter."
>
> "I am aware of it," said her husband; and did not even change color, but kept reading his book.

The specimens which we have given convey a fair idea of the character and style of this collection of stories. In most of them the tone is cheerful and the teaching true. If there are to be any such things as distinctive Sunday school libraries in the future, this volume may well find a place in every one. It has little or none of the goody-goody element about it, but inculcates simple lessons of morality, as part of a truthful and entertaining account of the manners, customs, and methods of thought in vogue among a strange people.

A chapter of Chinese proverbs follows the stories, and the book ends with a true story of a Chinese girl, one of Mr. Moule's pupils. Of the forty proverbs these three are worthy of note:

> Think of your own faults the first part of the night (when you are awake), and of the faults of others the latter part of the night (when you are asleep).
>
> You may be uncivil to a great man; but mind you are respectful to a small man.
>
> Use men as you use wood. If one inch is rotten, you must not reject the whole piece.

We add that the stories are illustrated by fac simile copies of the outline engravings which belong to them in the original Chinese work.

THE COURT OF RUSSIA.

Interesting Reminiscences from an ex-Attache of a European Embassy.

A foreigner may pass months and years in St. Petersburg without gaining much knowledge of the people. Russians are very pleasant, but, in a degree, sphinxes. The intense cold, the snow and rain which at St. Petersburg fall nine months in the year, and the scorching heat of the other three months, seriously interfere with outdoor intercourse. Russian life seems to shun the light of day. As the city is constantly involved in a mist which prevents unaccustomed eyes from distinguishing the colors and outlines of objects placed at a certain distance, so is life hidden beneath a thick and uniform coat of varnish which renders the perception of characters most difficult. It takes a foreigner a long time to recognize the traits peculiar to the German, the Russian, and the Pole beneath a cosmopolitan mask. And yet what is called life seems to be found only where all trace of nationality disappears. The upper classes have generally adopted the French manners, language, and customs. These are necessary to any one who wishes to take a hand in public affairs. It looks as though everybody were acting a comedy for the purpose of misleading observers. Every one moves, speaks, and dresses in public according to a pattern. The true life of the individual begins only when the official comedy is over.

The words "nobility" and "aristocracy" have hardly any meaning in St. Petersburg, although the saying of Alfred Windischgraetz that "no one should be called a man unless he is at least a baron" is nowhere so true as in the Russian capital. "Distinction" is a word that designates the high rank to which a family is entitled. Social standing is not determined by wealth, education, or lineage. Walouieff owes his fortune to his commanding stature, to his beauty and elegance, and to the grace with which he danced at Moscow in the presence of the Emperor Nicholas. The dynasty of the Romanoffs, following the tradition of Peter the Great, has made it a point of its policy to repress the ambition of the oldest families, and to see that only those who have rendered it important services meet with the highest recognition. A case in point is that of Komissaroff, who, it is claimed, saved the life of Czar Alexander on April 16, 1866. One Karakozoff shot at the Czar as he was entering his carriage after his usual walk in his summer garden. Komissaroff was a cap maker, 23 years old, from the province of Kostroma. He was originally a peasant, and he had been but a short time in St. Petersburg. By mere accident he was among the persons nearest to the Emperor when Karakozoff fired his pistol. Komissaroff, frightened by the shot, swooned. In the confusion and excitement no one paid any attention to him. Gen. Totleben, who was also walking in the summer garden, heard the report of the pistol, and ran to the scene of the shooting. There he found the cap maker and a young locksmith, who declared that the fainting man had turned aside the murderer's arm and saved the Emperor's life. When Komissaroff recovered his senses he found himself in the arms of Prince Souvaroff, the Governor-General of St. Petersburg. The locksmith had disappeared. Komissaroff was taken to the Winter Palace and conducted to the Emperor, who was surrounded by a brilliant staff of Generals and dignitaries of the empire. The Emperor embraced him saying: "I create you a gentleman—behave according to your new rank." Turning to his court, Alexander asked: "What do you think of this, gentlemen?"

A roaring hurrah was the reply, and from that moment Ossip Komissaroff became the idol of St. Petersburg. He was made the recipient of ovations that would take a volume to enumerate. Singularly enough, the wealth and honors lavished on him seemed to make Komissaroff a greater idiot than he had ever been. He had been a serf. Overcome by his honors, he visited his former master, and despondently asked for advice. He acknowledged that he had lost his senses on hearing the shot, as it was the first he had heard in all his life. He added that he knew nothing of the affair, and that he did not know what to do. The old gentleman had no little trouble in calming him and in inducing him to dry his tears. He was cautioned not to repeat his story. His denials were interpreted as impulses of a generous and modest nature. But his false position weighed heavily on his conscience. He could not accustom himself to the luxurious life that he was compelled to lead. Gen. Totleben was charged to see that he learned to read and write, and that he sustained his new rank with proper dignity. To Komissaroff life became a nightmare. He was by no means at ease in the elegant apartment assigned to him and his wife, who had been summoned to the capital. Nothing could soften his melancholy feeling. He was like a man transported to a foreign country, where he understood neither the language nor the manners of the people. He was overcome by nostalgia. Finally the truth came out. But as the mistake could not be corrected without exposing the court to ridicule, and without injustice to the innocent Ossip Komissaroff, the deception was kept up until the enthusiasm had subsided. The capmaker was then removed to Novgorod, and attached to a regiment of hussars as Lieutenant, a position which he still holds.

The Emperor and his court excited still greater ridicule by the interest they took in Komissaroff père. He was a criminal sentenced to many years' penal servitude in Siberia. He was pardoned and recalled. His return was a triumph. At the fêtes given in his honor he got beastly drunk and stole silver spoons and other articles of value. No one dared expose the father of "the Emperor's savior." At St. Petersburg he took in earnest the rôle of favorite of the Czar. By promising his support to wretches of his stamp, he made considerable money and a still greater proportion of debts. The good bourgeoisie of St. Petersburg dared not refuse anything to the father of "the savior of the Emperor." He sent his bills to the Winter Palace, and the Emperor good-naturedly paid them. He became so insolent that he whipped the sentries who opposed his entrance to the Alexandria Chateau, the Emperor's summer residence at Peterhof. His impudence was so great that the Governor of Alexandria, M. Nileff, finally reported him to the Emperor. The latter simply exiled him to Narva, on the German frontier, where he lived at the Czar's expense until his death.

It is said that the will of the Czar is law. This may not be strictly true, but persons who have not been in Russia cannot realize the extent to which it is true. The Czar's personality absorbs everything. He is the true and sole incarnation of the rights of eighty millions of inhabitants. In official quarters everything is forgotten when his name is pronounced. The very members of his family have no personality of their own. They are considered as mere emanations from the Czar. While I was at St. Petersburg I came across a strange book—the official catechism of the orthodox Greek Church. The following are extracts from the chapter entitled, "Duties of Every Faithful Orthodox Person toward his Sovereign:"

> *First Question*—According to the teachings of Christ, how is the authority of the autocrat reigning over all the Russias to be considered? *Answer*—As proceeding directly from God.
>
> *Third Question*—What do his subjects owe to the autocrat? *Answer*—Worship, obedience, fidelity, payment of taxes, services, love above all things, prayers—in short, anything that may be suggested by the words Adoration and Fidelity.
>
> *Fourth Question*—How is the Czar to be worshipped? *Answer*—In every way in our power, by words, thoughts, actions, and desires, with all the faculties of our minds, as well as with all our hearts.
>
> *Ninth Question*—By what means must we prove our love for him? *Answer*—By contributing according to our circumstances to the boundless success and glory of our autocrat, of his Government, and of all his family.
>
> *Seventeenth Question*—Why must we worship our autocrat? *Answer*—Because he is an emanation from God; because he is His lieutenant and representative. Disobedience to him is direct disobedience to God's will.

When we behold servility on so vast a scale, it is quite refreshing to think that humanity is not all cast in the same mould. You cannot forbear from admiring the revolutionists, who, though knowing that Siberia waits them, dare to challenge the omnipotence of this giant of all tyrants. It is not the peasants alone who look upon the Czar as a demigod and the absolute master of their bodies and souls. The aristocracy is even more servile. The only way in which it shows any independence is in the free use of its tongue in relating scandals of members of the imperial family whom it dislikes. The servility and flattery of the Russian courtier surpassed that of the famous Sieur of Croy, who, when asked the time by Charles V., replied, "Any hour that your Majesty wishes."

"Are things going on well in the empire?" asked a foreign diplomat of a dignitary of the court during the last years of the reign of Nicholas.

"How could they be otherwise," replied the courtier, "when his Majesty enjoys splendid health?"

In 1873 I had a long conversation with Prince D——. On being sounded as to the expediency of an alliance with France, Italy, and Austria against Germany, the Prince exclaimed, "Great heaven! Don't you know that the Czar is favorable to a policy of brotherhood with Germany?" He would not continue the topic of conversation.

The imperial family is scattered in various palaces. The Winter Palace is the residence of the Emperor and Empress. The Hereditary Grand Duke holds his court at the Anitchkine Palace. The Grand Duke Constantine dwells in the Marble Palace, one of the finest in the city. The Grand Duke Vladimir occupies a mansion distinguished by his name. Other members of the family are similarly quartered. The Winter Palace is really one of the world's wonders. All the various styles of architecture are blended in a puzzling and most effective way. It is said to have room for 5,000 people. The palace was destroyed by fire in 1837, and was rebuilt by the Emperor Nicholas, on a more magnificent scale, in less than fifteen months. The accumulation of such a mass of marble in so short a period smacks of the miraculous. The interior adds to the visitor's surprise. He is carried away with its splendors. The private apartments of the Emperor and Empress, and the bedroom in which Nicholas died, contrast strangely with all this luxury. The bedroom resembles the cell of a fanatical monk of the middle ages, unmindful of anything but penance. Its chief ornament is a narrow iron camp bedstead. Everything is exactly as Nicholas left it. Handkerchiefs are scattered over the furniture. If their number is any criterion, the imperial head must have been unpleasantly affected. The eyes of the visitor, however, are dazzled by the magnificence of the state apartments. The throne room of Peter I., the White Hall, the Hall of St. George, and the Gallery of the Field Marshals glisten with gold. Their grandeur, to be appreciated, must be seen on a fête day. Night illuminations are nowhere so well understood as in St. Petersburg. Gautier's "Winter in Russia" contains a magical description of a fête at the Winter Palace, under the light of five thousand colossal chandeliers.

The court stands on a footing worthy of a sovereign reigning over eighty millions of millionaires, and not over eighty millions of paupers. In the first years of the reign of the present Emperor 3,500 persons were attached to it. Their number has not decreased. These parasites are divided into seven corps, headed by two grand chamberlains, two grand marshals, two great equerries, two chief hunters, two chief stewards, a grand master of ceremonies, and a grand mistress of the robes. Up to within a few years the chamberlains in actual service numbered 160. Almost every prominent General in the army is aide-de-camp to the Emperor or to somebody of imperial blood. Maids of honor, gentlemen in waiting, pages, valets, and the like are so numerous that you would fancy that the whole city of St. Petersburg were engaged as servants either to the Czar or to some member of his family. Dress all these people in rich Russian uniforms, ornamented with an infinite variety of crosses and orders set in gold and precious stones, and mingle with them an army of beautiful ladies, with dazzling diamond diadems and necklaces, parading sculptural shoulders, and robed in lace, silk, and velvet of all colors and shades, each looking like an empress, and you have a faint conception of a State reception at the Winter Palace.

The Czar's income is not exactly known. It certainly surpasses that of any other sovereign in Europe. His Majesty stands too high to have the ordinary ideas as regards *meum* and *tuum*. He considers the crown domains the private property of his family. There is no reference to the actual amount of his revenue in the finance accounts of the State. He is too shrewd for that. The exact figure is, therefore, unknown to any one but himself and the Ministers of the Crown Domains and of the Imperial Household. The crown domains consist of about 1,200,000 square miles of cultivated land and forests, besides many gold and other mines in Siberia. The first estimate of the imperial revenue appeared in a British consular report for 1867. It was reckoned at £2,450,000 sterling. A gentleman long connected with the Ministry of the Imperial House tells me that the report is incorrect by a half. He bases his calculations upon its yearly expenditures, which, putting them, as he says, at a low figure, absorb nearly double that sum. As the Czar has no private debts, it may be safely inferred that he has at least 100,000,000 francs a year. Ten per cent. of the amount he devotes to charitable purposes. A large share of this charitable fund is absorbed in subsidies to theatres and presents to actresses. When the Emperor honors an artist with a gift the recipient may keep the glittering bauble, or it may be taken confidentially to the Treasury of the Hermitage, where the jewels are exchanged for cash at a moderate commission.

The Emperors of Russia have successively been distinguished by the titles of grand princes, grand lords, and czars. The name of Alexander II., accompanied by the following string of titles, appears in official documents:

> By the grace of God, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias, of Moscow, Kieff, Vladimir, and Novgorod; Czar of Kasan, Astrakan, Poland, Siberia, and Crimea; Lord of Caskoff and Grand Prince of Smolensk, Lithuania, Wallachia, Podolia, and Finland; Prince of Esthonia, Livonia, Courland, Semgalia, and Samogitia, of Bialystock, Karelia, Tver, Jougria, Perm, Viatka, Bulgaria, and other countries; Lord and Grand Prince of the Territory of lower Novgorod, of Tschernigoff, Riaizan, Plotzk, Rostof, Jaroslaf, Bielozero, Audoria, Obdoria, Kondinia, Vitebsk, and Mstislof; Lord sovereign of all the Hyperborean Regions; Lord of Iberia, Kartalinia, Grousinia, Kabardinia, and Armenia; Hereditary Lord and Sovereign of the Tcherkess Princes of the Mountains; Hereditary Duke of Norway, Schleswig-Holstein, Horman, Ditmarsen, and Oldenburg, &c.

Nicholas had added to all these the title of "God-fearing Lord." Alexander has dropped it.

Before Ivan III. Wassiliewitch, the crest of the imperial family was a cavalier in silver armor on a red field. Dimitri Donskoi added a dragon to it, and the cavalier became a St. George piercing the monster with a spear. Oleg, it is said, had the figure of this saint inlaid on the shield which he suspended at the gate of Kieff on his return from his expedition to Constantinople. All his successors adopted this coat of arms, with the exception of Vladimir, who selected an escutcheon with three circles forming a triangle. A letter from this Prince, bearing this crest, may be seen in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. An inscription within the upper circle, literally translated, reads as follows:

> Our God, the Trinity which has ever been; not three gods, but one substance and one God.

The lower circle on the right contains the titles of the prince to whom the letter is addressed; the one on the left the titles of the Czar who sent it. Ivan III., having married Zoe or Sophia, the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor, Constantine Palæologus, adopted the latter's crest, as heir to the rights of the extinguished dynasty. Russians frequently resort to this matrimonial argument to sustain their claims upon Constantinople. Thus the Roman eagle became the symbol of the Russian monarchy. It is a double-headed eagle, spreading its wings and holding a gold sceptre in its right claw and grasping a globe with its left. It bears on its breast a red shield, upon which St. George on horseback is represented in the act of felling a dragon. The two crowned heads of the eagle are surmounted by a large crown. This shield is enclosed within nine smaller ones, representing the principal provinces of the empire. The whole is surrounded by the collar of the order of St. Andrew, surmounted by the imperial crown.

The succession to the throne of Russia has been regulated in various ways. Women have never been excluded. Peter I., opposed in his projects by his son Alexis, by a ukase dated Feb. 16, 1722, asserted for every sovereign the right of designating his successor even outside of the imperial family. The Emperor Paul, by an act of April 16, 1797, reëstablished the hereditary principality according to the ancient tradition of primogeniture. Alexander I. confirmed this act (Aug. 16, 1823) when, by the birth of the present Emperor (April 17, 1818), he was assured that his brother Nicholas would have descendants. The princes of the reigning house are improperly called Romanoffs. They are related to the latter only in the third degree by the female line. Their true name is Holstein-Gottorp. But nothing is so offensive to their ears as a reference to their questionable habit of styling themselves Romanoffs.

Another bit of information concerns the will of Peter the Great. The foreign polity of Russia can hardly be understood without knowing something about this singular document. History affords no other instance of the kind. This will contains three main clauses, which all his successors have strenuously endeavored to carry out. Peter the Great recommended first the famous *Divide et Impera*. "Estrange as much as possible," he wrote, "from one another the various States of Europe, so that you may control them all. Always have a standing army such as may, according to the opportunity, serve for the purpose of war in time of peace, and secure peace in time of war. Employ all the forces of the country to open for yourselves the two routes to Constantinople and to India." All the Czars have tried to fulfil these conditions, but none so successfully as Alexander II. But Peter the Great neglected to warn his descendants as to the course they should follow respecting their subjects. He forgot to remind them that nothing can be accomplished by a prince who cannot win the love of his people. This counsel would perhaps have proved more valuable to them than the other three, and certainly Alexander has, during the last fifteen years, done less in this direction than any of his predecessors.